A COMPARISON

BETWEEN

SHAKESPEARE'S AND SCHILLER'S MACBETH.

A Thesis submitted in partial satisfaction

of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Letters

at the University of California.

by

Dorothy Rebecca Burdorf.

Berkeley, California, May, 1908.

A TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Table of Contents Con'td.

Despite its faults, the translation is a fine piece of work.

A Comparison of Schiller's and Shakespeare's Macbeth.

Schiller had but just finished the Wallenstein. Weary with the long siege of war and political study that it required, he turned for relief to a tragedy in the realm of womens hearts - to Maria Stuart. But the personality of the hero whose acquaintance he had been cherishing foremost for several years would not be forgotten in a moment. He felt compelled to pay him yet one more visit, this time as the original from which he had first builded his Wallenstein. For his conception of the German hero, Schiller had long and carefully studied the Macbeth of Shakespeare. He felt so impressed with its many beauties and strengths, that he wished to render it possible for the German people - the Germans, who today stage our Shakespeare oftener than we. Setting aside the unfinished Maria Stuart he exerted his strength to make a translation of Macbeth. A translation, he calls it, yet he follows so often his own bent of fancy in verse, tries to remold to suit his formulated theories of drama, and of the tragedy especially, that one had best call it but a free reworking of the original.

Schiller's concept of the tragic embodies the idea that the highest pleasure is a moral pleasure - a moral pleasure which is the greater in proportion as it has obstacles to overcome. In other words, it is accompanied by pain. The universal feeling that in

continuing to live is the physical purpose of man's life, gives way to some higher moral feeling. For instance - the satisfaction we feel, say, when the soldier lays down his life that his country may be free, when the missionary risks a life for the service in a leper colony. The highest art of poetry is therefore that which utilizes most this highest pleasure. In his essay on Tragic Art, Schiller says tragedy is that art which makes the delight of pity ~~for~~ its special object, by imitating nature, or such acts as are principally capable of awakening the emotions of sympathy. Of all Shakespeare's tragedies, Macbeth is strongest in working the emotions of pity, strongest in its conflict of events that bring two deaths, which our higher morals demand. The action of the play is beautifully terrific and coherent to the black storm of the spirit pervading. In breathlessly short time the terrible seed for the whole tale is planted, it shoots to staggering heights in the main doing, and is at once snapped off at the catastrophe to a peace and calm. The events of the whole story consume scarcely two weeks.

The play, however, loses much of its force through Schiller's tampering. To fit his dramatical theories, and suit the exigencies of the German stage the remaking was often to the drama's hurt. Steinweg says: "Schiller's Macbeth ist eine Misgeburt, die als Schullektüre unbrauchbar ist. Schiller ist nicht einmal Schiller in der Sprache und wo er es ist, wie z. B. in der eingelegten Fischerballade und in dem Pförtnerlied, passt er nicht in den Lokalton." In justification however the same critic says: "Für

Schiller gilt dabei, dasz noch kaum ein Dichter oder Künstler das Meisterstück eines anderen hätte wiederholen oder transponieren können." In a letter of June, 1800, to his friend Körner, Schiller himself writes of his work; "Freilich macht er gegen das englische Original eine schlechte Figur; aber das ist nicht meine Schuld, sondern der Sprache und der vielen Einschränkungen, welche das Theater notwendig machte."

This excuse will, however, not hold for the real breaks from the original, which are the most harmful. From R. Gericke, in "Zu einer neuen Bühnenbearbeitung des Macbeth" we quote the following: "Der Hauptmangel an Schiller's Macbeth besteht darin, dasz er dem Charakter das charakteristische des Shakespeareschen nicht streng genug festhält. Vornehmlich die Hauptrolle, die Rolle Macbeths, hat in dieser Beziehung so Wesentliches verloren, dasz das ganze Werk schwer darunter leidet." And truly 'tis a very different Macbeth that we get in Schiller's work. He may merely have conceived the original as he gives it, and made changes to make his view the more apparent. He may have thought he would like such a Macbeth as he conceives the better. From the very beginning Schiller lays special stress on the idea that his hero begins with a heart that is pure and noble. From Shakespeare we think the same at first, but are not so sure of an unflecked state as we go on. Schiller would have us positive. His witches in the first scene say- (1,1,24) "Ins Verderben führen den <u>edlen</u> Held"

(1,1,36) "Er ist tapfer, gerecht und gut,"

(1,1,39) "Strauchelt der Gute und fällt der Gerechte."

Wherever he can, Schiller inserts an extra edel where Shakespeare has none. (1,8,460) "Sey mir willkommen, edler, theuerer Held-"

(1,4,14) "Welcome hither;

I have begun ---"

(2,2,825) "Wie, edler Sir? Noch nicht zurRuh?"

(2,1,13) What Sir, not yet at rest.

In 1,6,313, Ross brings "Ruhmgekrönter Macbeth, dem König kam ---" against "The king hath happily received, Macbeth", wherever he can Schiller will use double epithets of praise:

(1,8,440) "Otheuer Vetter! Stütze meines Reichs!" he says where Shakespeare has merely "Oworthiest Cousin;" Sometimes he substitutes an adjective more forceful than the original; for instance "ruhmwürdiger Cawdor," against a stereotyped "my worthy thane!" Schillers nobler man does not admit the necessity of action to drown his cowardice in "Words to the heat of deeds too cold breath gives." but instead - "Rasch vorwärts, Macbeth, und es ist gethan!" (2,3,899).

In Shakespeare the effective working of the witches' prophecies requires a mind already tainted. When Macbeth and Banquo come upon the heath, says Brooke's, "Macbeth's soul is at one with the tempest and the blasted heath and the supernatural cry." Banquo on the contrary has no such feeling; to him the day is but a usual one and the witches with their prophecies leave him undisturbed.

Schiller sings a new witch story - a fisherballad, in which the witches tell how they lay traps and tricks for men just because they are good.

Einen Fischer fand ich, zerlumpt und arm,
Der flickte singend die Netze,
Und trieb sein Handwerk ohne Harm,
Als besäsz er köstliche Schätze,
Und den Morgen und Abend, nimmer müd,
Begrüszt' er mit seinem lustigen Lied.
Mich verdrosz des Bettlers frohen Gesang, (1,4,160)

They ask the rhetorical question,

"Er ist tapfer, gerecht und gut
Warum versuchen wir ~~win~~ seyn Blut?" to answer with the statement of their creed:

Strauchelt der Gute und fällt der Gerechte
Dann jubilieren die höllischen Mächte."

This concept is furthered in the effect of the prophecies as the two poets give them. Schiller omits entirely Banquo's saying - "That he seems rapt withal." These words would indicate that what the witches said had hit with thoughts of their kind already existing - that is, not concrete thoughts of murder, but rather that Macbeth had really harbored the thought of some day being king. In Act 1, Scene 3, Macbeth says,

"This supernatural soliciting
Cannot be good." This suggests there may have been a natural

soliciting before. In Schiller they prophecies are startling new ideas, which he cannot adjust to his old habits of thought: "Diese wunderbare Eröffnung kann nicht böse seyn -" (376).

"Zwey Theile des Orakels" he also says - an oracle then, a prophecy bound to be fulfilled, it fixes itself in Macbeth's mind. For what fate has decreed we surely cannot blame him. To Shakespeare's Macbeth they are "two truths told" - he'll make it his business that the third be a truth also - it has been a vague thought for long enough. "Zum Pfand des höchsten dritten" says Schiller. Two parts of the oracle are true - they pledge the third and hence would demand active movements to grasp his crown, is what Schiller would infer. Shakespeare however says these two truths, two graded honors, the second above the first, are "happy prologues to the swelling act of imperial theme." His way grows clearer then, he is getting a concrete ladder by which to climb to what was off in the distance before. Schiller makes the prophecies one and all seem the more startling by the concrete stating of Sinel's death as occurring but the night before.

)1,5,275) "Ich weisz durch Sinel's meines Vaters Tod,
Der <u>diese Nacht</u> verschieden, bin ich Than von Glamis!" The world in general did not yet know that he was thane, hence this knowledge is as supernatural in the witches as that they should strike it right concerning Cawdor. To Shakespeare's hero there is no such startling coincidence.

"By Sinel's death, I know I am thane of Glamis." There is nothing to lead one to infer that he had not been thane for some years prior.

The Schiller Macbeth writes to his wife: "Da ich nach neuen Dingen forschen wollte

Verschwanden sie" (506) - he wished further substantiation, I suppose, before he took any rash steps. He doesn't like to go at any thing so monentous without being sure. The Macbeth of Shakespeare "burns in desire to question them further" The prophecies have hit thoughts of their like and he is eager-the fulfillment is really to come! "Welche Hoheit uns Erwartet" (515) (no ¶) Schiller says, and not merely "what greatness is promised thee" as in Shakespeare.

And Schiller would have us to think that Macbeth's hesitancy was a matter of conscience. He has the wife say of her Lord- "du möchtest gerne

Grosz seyn, doch dein Gewissen auch bewahren!" Shakespeare carefully avoids any allusions to a care for conscience. "Thou woulds't be great,

Art not without ambition; but without

The illness should attend it." A peculiar kind of a conscience that, that ' would not play false and yet would wrongly win.' Nowhere is there any direct remorse, nor hints of a suffering conscience-suffering I say, for he is yet too young in deeds of such nature to have them erased entirely with the doing. The illness which he fears is the loss of his honour. In his monologue where he weighs the possible results of Duncan's murder, the blotch to his honour if

such were known is what he considers. "We'd jump the life to come," he says. He is a valorous soldier first in the ranks of the death dealers, and the mere going out of life does not appal him. His three considerations against killing Duncan, as his being kinsman, as guest, and having been so kind to all and to him especially, are no plea of a worrying conscience. They do not bother him after the deed is done. His one fear is that it be known of him that he has committed crime - the highest of all crimes, that against the crown. He is frightened, of course, and sees all kinds of things that frighten him. But were his troubles remorse, Banquo were not so quickly added to his conscience list. But have him out of the way,-him, the only one who could yet tell anything that might hint of his smudged honour, and he "were perfect, founded as rock, whole as marble, as broad and general as the casing air." Banquo's visits in spirit are not the promptings of remorse. He coolly states the real reality to his hired murderers - " I could

With barefaced power sweep him from my sight,
And bid my will avouch it, yet I must not
For certain friends that are both his and mine
Whose loves I may not drop - but wail his fall
who I my self struck down."

Instead of yielding himself to remorse he steeps more and more recklessly into blood, innocent blood. If the bare taking of life were to shadow his conscience, there would weigh, too, that he had slain in cold blood the two innocent watchmen of the bedchamber. They do not haunt his dreams, for through their death he sees rather

his valorous honor assured.

"O, yet I do repent me of my fury,
That I did kill him" ----
"Who could refrain,
That had a heart to love, and in that heart
Courage to make's love known?"

(No.9) After this deed these men are dead in every sense - even their spirits, which would surely recur to a tender conscience. Once suspicion has begun to touch his honour, his care even for that vanishes. Macduff's wife and babes and all his household are sacrificed. What a hypocrite he is, when he says,

"Had I but died an hour before this chance
I had lived a blessed time: for from this instant
There's nothing serious in mortality,
All is but toys: renown and grace is dead;
The wine of life is drawn and the mere lees
Is left this vault to brag of."

'Tis said for effect. - to throw off suspicion. But once does the man really give way to his inward self and then - 'tis but the pathos of the dishonoured man's condition that we get when he says - "My way of life
Is fallen in the sear, the yellow leaf;
And that which should accompany old age,
As honour, love, obedience, troops of friends,
I must not look to have; but, in their stead,

Curses, not loud, but deep,
mouth honour, breath
Which the poor heart would fain deny, and dare not. -"

Schiller strives to relieve the impression of such an utter lack of conscience:

(956) "Das ist ein trauriger Anblick. Oh!" says Macbeth. There is a great deal of added pathos in the oh, which Shakespeare does not suggest. The plain (this break in the line is not intended)

"This is a sorry sight" is much less moving. The actor could put almost as much tense feeling into that as we expect of the Lady's "Oh" over her hands that will not sweeten. And Schiller adds a heart-wrung "Wehe! Wehe!" (1016) where he speaks of the hands that will redden the multitudinous seas. He also omits such an unnecessary heartless remark as where Macbeth speaks of the blood on the murderer's face; "'Tis better thee without than him within." And where he can, unobserved, Schiller omits some little inconsequential hypocritical statement, as where to Duncan, the hero says, "The rest is labour which is not used for you." He does not "commend", in Schiller, Banquo and Fleance to their horses backs. He does not sink to the depths of requiring it of the Lady that she be especially hypocritical to Banquo. His statement in Schiller is general against the guests at the coming banquet, whereas Shakespeare says: "Let your remembrance,

Apply to Banquo: present him eminence both
With eye and tongue."

Not only is Schiller's man too noble to ask this of his wife; he is also the more loving and the tendrer husband who would not do so. "How does your patient?" asks the husband in Shakespeare, but "Wie steht's um ihre liebe Kranke?" The Schiller Macbeth mourns the passing of his partner in love and crime. The author makes sure that we see that, by inserting, when the news of the wife's death is brought, "(nach einem langen Stillschweigen)"; and shortly after "(nachdem er gedankenvoll auf und ab gegangen)".

All our testimony would seem to bear against the statement of Gericke, but yet we would maintain it. In his "Zu einer Neuen Bühnenbearbeitung des Macbeth," he says, "Die gewaltige Tragik des Macbeth liegt in der innern Zerrissenheit Macbeth's, in seinem steten Kampfe mit sich selbst; und dieser Zwiespalt, diese Zerrüttung seines Wesens musz, besonders gegen das Ende hervortreten, je weniger der Dichter dafür getan hat, uns durch Handlungen zu zeigen, dasz Macbeth nicht der "hartgesottene" Bösewicht ist, dem er scheinen kann. Aus seinen Worten heraus müssen wir fühlen ~~wir~~, wie er fortwährend auf der Folter der Leidenschaft und des Gewissens zuckt und wie er vom ersten Augenblick an seine Verschuldigung büssend, einem sich immer steigenden Kampfe erliegt. Uns das fühlen wir bis auf den Grund der sturm - zerwühlten Seele Macbeth's, bei Shakespeare, wo wir durch jedes Wort hindurchblicken! in jedem ein tiefes Leiden als Ursache und als Wirkung seines Handelns empfindet. Das fühlen wir nicht viel, oder weniger bei Schiller. Hier ist das Wort mehr nur Ausdruck des Gedankens, der Reflexion, und diese bei Shakespeare blas Nebensache, Vehikel, hier Hauptsache." That he was not a "hartgesottene Bösewicht" in the beginning, we agree. He showed himself in Shakespeare, too, a

pattern husband for that day, the bravest of soldiers, but against the evidences of a soul torn in remorseful conflict, or at any conflict against the wickedness itself we must protest. It is only his imagination that causes him suffering. The air drawn dagger, the voice he hears after his first deed of crime, and Banquo's ghost are all creatures of his fancy. They are what make him waver and sway. Given another position in life and he might have added his name to the list of poets. To quote from Brooke (p.200) - "Before, during and after the murder, this imagination, blown into white heat by the intense passion of the hour is so alive and powerful, that it doubles the horror of the murder.--- It flies from heaven to earth and down to hell.--- It blackens all Nature with his thought. It drags in the remotest things to increase the terror of the present. Hecate, Tarquin, whose strides towards his design are like those of withered murder with her sentinel the wolf. In the very midst of slaughter, he hears a voice "Sleep no more! Macbeth hath murdered sleep," and at the word his imagination takes fire and runs away from the horror of the moment into all the poetry of sleep - strange island of peaceful imagination in this sea of murder- "the innocent sleep

Sleep that knits up the ravell'd sleave of care
The death of each day's life, sore labour's bath,
Balm of hurt minds, great nature's second course,
Chief nourisher in life's feast"

There speaks the natural poet. Lady Macbeth, who has none of this imagination, cannot comprehend this divagation: "What do you mean?"

she says. He is the same throughout. He adds more than an imaginative, I may say an artist's touch to everything he says. Matter, passion and form are equally good. He is always mixing up his deeds and himself with the whole of Nature."

Our concept of Shakespeare's Macbeth would agree, in short, somewhat with Thümmel, who maintains that Macbeth was at first not only a bold conqueror, but a man pure in deed. Temptation approaches in the shape of the witches and wakens, through tricking prophecies, thoughts and wishes, which heretofore lay in the bottom of his soul, unspoken and without definite form and shape. At first he wavers, but the phantasy keeps recurring to his mind till, full of self love and without the power or the will to free himself from the dream pictures - in short, a man of worldly sensitiveness and without a strong conscience, he throws over all scruples at the naming of Malcolm as heir. "Macbeth bietet den Anblick einer sinnlichen Natur, die im Taumel bacchantischer Lust des edlen "Ich" ertränkt (p.112).

Schiller gives Macbeth several traits that tell of Wallenstein (cf. Köster p.77). He is a more careful, politic man of affairs, such as was Wallenstein. In Shakespeare, Macbeth merely says, "to be King Stands not within the prospect of belief -." Schiller's Macbeth points out the political obstacles - "Dasz ich König einst seyn werde

Ist eben so unglaublich, da dem Duncan

Zwey Söhne leben." These same objections he raises again in a speech to his wife, which we find only in the translation,

(1,15,747) "Wird uns der blut'ge Mord zum Ziele führen?

Steht dieser Kumberland nicht zwischen mir

Und Schottlands Thron? Und lebt nicht Donalbain?
Für Dunkans Söhne nur und nicht für uns
Arbeiten wir, wenn wir den König tödten."

And it is such a very different Lady too that Schiller gives us. He leaves out but few lines, adds a few words and changes others, but where before we have the gentle wife, overzealous for her husband's glory, through her strong love for him; where we have a woman led beyond her woman's nature to do demonic things, to bring finally the repentance of self destruction, Schiller presents a vicious sort of a vixen - "eine Überhexe." She is now a shrewder creature, working down all difficulties, understanding her husband and how to work him even more than the brave little strongheart of Shakespeare.

This one sees that it is the imagination that is her husbands trouble. "Diese Furchtgespenster" she says are his only hindrance, where the Shakespeare Lady merely says - "All that impedes thee from the golden round." She does not gently read his character as being "too full of the milk of human kindness, to catch the nearest way." "Du bist zu sanft geartet"- toosoft - easy she would say instead. And how wise she is now. She has political insight added to her other shrewdness.

(No. 11)(754) "Ich kenne diese Thans" she says, and she does. She shows in this speech, (private to Schiller,) the way that will go direct from the deed to the crowning of Macbeth - the way that Macbeth could not see.

Even that great love that is her undoing and brings her husband

to ruin, she is shorn of her in the translation. We feel that Schiller conceived of her as being ambitious for queenly dignities - not merely striving for Macbeth. She is curt and snappy where in the original she is the personification of solicitousness. The Shakespearean wife gives her list of advice in sympathy that meets more than half way. "He that's coming, must be provided for." Schiller's Lady gives a speech all exclamation marks, all commands. For the above quotation we find (597) "Geh, denke jetzt Auf nichts, als deinen Gast wohl zu empfangen." And after this command, she gives the word "Überlasz dich mir. In the English version, she offers kindly, instead, to put her shoulder to the wheel, to bear part of the burden; "Leave all the rest to me." Where in Shakespeare the Lady finds the occasion demands that she be sarcastically upbraiding, in Schiller she grows even contemptuous. She begins with a curt "Wie?", changes rhetorical question to contemptuous scornful accusation and ends (as in 729) with some biting epithet - "Klein(=)muthiger!" Just after the first murder where she waits expectantly for the outcome of its doing, she turns in the English text to greet her husband from his deed of blood with a fond sympathetic "My husband!" She is ready to take whatever the result. But in German there is a "Nun, mein Gemahl?" which it seems would assure an outburst if all had not been to her wish. Again as Shakespeare has Macbeth come on to tell of the voice which calls "Sleep no more," the Lady, who does not comprehend, asks quietly, "What do you mean?" But the creation in Schiller addresses

him as one does to rebuke a child through trying to make it feel foolish: -

"Wie, Sir, was soll das alles?"

The Schiller Lady can come back from the scene of crime and heartlessly say how the guilt of the deed has been transferred to the hands and faces of others. In Shakespeare, however, it is the sympathetic wife again who wishes to be a partner to her husband, even in his crime. 'My hands are of your color, but I am ashamed does not share with you the guilt of the actual doing.' So often in Schiller, she puts in an extra curt word of address, which from its being utterly uncalled for might cut very deeply. Where the knocking is heard she inserts an extra (1034) "O sey ein Mann". Compare the "Are you a man?" of the banquet scene and "Seyd ihr ein Mann, Sir?", also "My worthy lord, your noble friends do lack you" and the shortness of "Sir, Eure Gäste warten,", then see the sweetness and softness of the words in, "Come on, gentle my lord, sleek o'er your rugged looks" and contrast with it the impatience and formal wording of "Kommt, kommt, mein König, mein geliebter Herr,

Klärt Eure finstern Blicke auf."

In the Second Scene of the Third Act, Shakespeare has the Lady bid her servant crave her husband's leisure for a few words and ask that he come to her. The Schiller Lady, on the contrary, blurts in unannounced upon her husband, where he sits rapt in thought. She breaks out with a curt, "Wie, mein Gemahl", while Shakespeare leads one to understand ~~translate~~ her words as meaning ~~saying~~ "Well how is it with you now, my lord". She goes on to console his picture-troubled phantasy in the

soft phrasing of "Why do you keep alone, of sorriest fancies your companions making." This Schiller renders as a scolding (1710)

"Wie, mein Gemahl?
Warum so viel allein?
Was kann es helfen, dasz ihr eure Träume
Zur traurigen Gesellschaft wählt?"

Nor is the Lady in Schiller so gracious a hostess. To Duncan she seems rather to give the air of condescending:

(654) "Ihr seyd in eurem Eigenthum, mein König,
Wir geben nur, was wir von euch empfingen." It is however the Lady versed in graces who speaks in, "Your servants ever
Have theirs, themselves, and what is theirs, in compt,
To make their audit at your highness pleasure,
Still to return your own."

No ¶ Yes, even Macbeth himself feels called upon to upbraid her, before the guests themselves, for not being more the hostess. In the banquet scene, he says, (1867) "Denn unsre Wirtin, seh ich, ist zu lässig
In ihrer Pflicht. Wir wollen sie ersuchen
Geschäftiger zu seyn um ihre Gäste."

(No ¶) There is no such suggestion in the original:

"Our hostess keeps her state; but, in best time,
We will require her welcome."

Schiller gives us an insight into his conception where he inserts the side note after the discovery of the dead king, which

says, "die Lady stellt sich als ohnmächtig vor"! Pretends nothing! The woman had worked herself, in the stress of the moment, out of herself. A new emotional strength had led her to a capability, a force beyond that of a man. A transformed being, she not only dares to do herself, but can fill her weaker husband with the spirit of action. But once during that whole awful day and night does her sex show itself - she is reminded of her father in Duncan and cannot herself wield the dagger. She keeps herself keyed up from the early morning when the letter comes, through and after the action till at the discovery she can at last bear up no longer and yields to her weaker self. Then comes the reaction - she really faints. From that time on she is all tired and short in her replies except where she must maintain outward show and shield her husband. The fire - the "Tigers Grimm" is all gone, she urges no further shed of blood, in fact takes but little interest in the succeeding murders; her soul is already too heavily weighed with the one. She never rallies from listlessness except when she finds she must encourage her husband, or help him away from the suspicions of others. The keynote to the real actual remorse which she suffers, Schiller leaves out. That pathetic insight comes in the little monologue which she lets escape from her tortured soul when there is none to hear it.

"Naught's had, all's spent
Where our desire is got without content.
'Tis safer to be that which we destroy
Than by destruction dwell in doubtful joy."

No. But an Instant~~ly~~ la~~ter~~ter she represses this conflict within herself to minister to her husband, to give him encouragement; for now all the new obstacles begin to assert themselves.

The Lady of Shakespeare states well her own condition in the words ~~of her own mouth~~ - "Screw your courage to the sticking point." That's what she has done to herself. She is screwed to her highest nervous pitch till she is a being diametrically opposed to her ordinary self. Sie feuert sich mit dem, was die "Wachter trunken macht, zur (no "break in this line intended) That an, um doch schlieszlich das Weib zu bleiben." In the end she is the remorseful poor little weakness that lays violent hands on herself. Schiller changes this self made statement of her condition to the shrewd contemptuousness of a hardened creature for another conceived by her as cowardly

(766) "Fuhr es aus mit "Mannermut und fester Hand,
"So kann es nicht mislingen."

It seems that Schiller in so changing the Lady ~~knocks at~~ goes counter to his own theories. He chooses the Macbeth as being the strongest of Shakespeare's tragedies; and the tragedy, ~~which~~ he states to be the result of the art which makes the delight of pity its special object. So far, so good, the original offers plenteous call for pity. But the most pathetic of all the characters is that of the Lady. He states himself in his essay On Tragic Art that the object of the pity must not too much displease us, must not excite our hatred. Why then does he rob himself of such a fine chance for pity by

making us to veritably hate the hard hearted wretch of a Lady that he creates. We are glad instead to see her really tormented in the end. The first law of tragic art, he says in his essay on the Pathetic, is the exhibition of suffering. Where could there be a finer display of suffering than that of the Lady whose soul wrings forth the pathetic "Naught's had, all's spent," and who yet is brave enough to choke it down before all others. The second law is the resistance to that suffering. Schiller spoils both by omitting any conscious confession to remorse. He will have her torture of the fifth Act none but that of a weak woman's brain terrorized in sleep.

We feel, furthermore, an added pity for the wife in Shakespeare that in the end she should be so severed from the sympathy and partnership of her king. She has wrecked her peace of mind, ruined her life that her husband may realize a cherished ambition, only to have herself cut off from the one being of all the world to her. "She should have died hereafter" he says when he hears of her death. This sorrow is not so much heaped on her in Schiller, for his Macbeth gives evidence of tender regard to the very end.

The case is reversed as regards Macbeth himself. Poetic justice demands his death; moral fitness requires it; his cool, deliberate heaping of death upon death, one as innocent as the other, ask that we desire him out of the way. This killing of Macbeth's virtue by degrees is necessary. Of course, we can feel sorry that such a grand courageous animal of a man were not turned to execute nobler things, but we must have each new heartles crime tear away

a still lingering shred of pity. Schiller clings to the end to trying to make us like the man, whom really, when all is said, we should not, do not pity.

And again, what a finer chance for pity could he want than the scene at Macduff's castle. Scarcely anything more pathetic can be conceived than the actual presentation of the murder of innocent childhood and womanhood. And they, too, do not act the frightened cowards when death is ~~eminent~~ imminent. They represent the show of suffering. The precocious boy gives his mother a last warning cry before he expires. The Lady boldly speaks for her husband and slanders the villian to his face that slays her. The contrast, too, of the innocent playfulness of the scene just before the murderers come, makes greater the call for pity. Through this scene ,too,we conceive better, ~~too,~~ the blackness of Macbeth. With the deed before our very eyes in the entirety of its horror, we cannot but wish him tracked with that vengeance which over~~reaches~~ takes him. 'Tis so much cooler, so much easier to feel sorry for Macbeth when Schiller leaves out the scene entirely. The reference to it after it is done has about the force as compared with its actual occurrence,as does the newspaper account compared with the murder which happens in our own house.

Another notable change which Schiller makes is in the concept of the witches. Shakespeare gives them the personality that was popularly conceived of the witches of that day. They are ugly, mannish, quickly moving creatures. They flit on to the stage, fling a few mysterious words and are off again. Schiller's are riesenhaft" big clumsy creatures that are standing ready on the

stage as the curtain goes up. They are not capable of ~~the quick~~ deceptive quickness. Instead of phrases full of hidden meaning, and suited to the quick movements in snappiness, these hold lengthy discussions, which give clearly all their meaning and intentions. Shakespeare's witches say - "There to meet Macbeth" and are off. Schiller's talk calmly to tell how and why and what's to do. Shakespeare has his witches speak in witchy phrases that catch the popular ear. There is so much more of the flit and whirl for instance in the "hurly burly" than the clumsy stilted "Kriegs getümmel." In Shakespeare they speak of the witchy cat which is a power with them. " I come Graymalkin" and "Thrice the brinded cat hath mewed." In Schiller, instead, they obey a mightier call: "Es ruft der Meister." Nor do they ~~with him~~ league with they evil weathers and "hover through fog and filthy air." As a dignified god might - "durch die Luft den Weg genommen!" They disappear as a Jupiter with a display of thunder and lightning.

Hecate is conceived as a divinely invisible presence assisting thus at the final triumph over Macbeth:

"Ich will unsichtbar um euch seyn
Und selber meine Macht euch leihn." This suits Schiller better than the common head witch who can purpose to spend the night

"Unto a dismal and a fatal end" and says, "I am for the air;---
Upon the corner of the moon
There hangs a vaporous drop profound;
I'll catch it ere it come to ground."

(No ¶) Instead of a queen who would use that vaporous drop profound

which "distilled by magic sleights

Shall raise such artificial sprites

As, by the strength of their illusion

Shall draw him on to his confusion," Schiller prefers a mightier power who has obedient serving powers to do her work. This latter one can send her invisible aid, but the Shakespearean Hecate openly meets her co-workers at the black and murky "pit of Acheron" where the charm is at last "firm and good". In Schiller we do not have her actual presence to bestow approval. Instead the completed effectiveness is assured through the suggestion (Es erscheinen zwerghafte Geister, welche in dem Kessel rühren)" Shakespeare brings on the hideous little queen again to say,

"O well done! I commend your pains

And every one shall share i' the gains

And now about the cauldron sing

Like elves and fairies in a ring

Enchanting all that you put in."

Where Shakespeare uses the thunder and lightning it is ~~more~~ just to give the temper of the day's atmosphere, the atmosphere which is to give a forecast of the blackness coming into Macbeth's heart. Schiller uses it more to give the added effect to the divine character of the witches. When they make the statement of their creed,

"Strauchelt der Gute and fällt der Gerechte,

Dann jubilieren die höllischen Mächte," there is a special

dispensation of atmospheric display, and again in (Sie verschwinden unter Donner und Blitz.) With him they do not have charge of the winds as in Shakespeare

"I'll give thee a wind"

"And I another."

"I myself have all the other."

As much as he can Schiller avoids all the commonness of witch terms and superstitions. Shakespeare smacks very much of the vulgar. His witches suggest throughout a filthiness that is a fit preface for all that's uncanny. They "sail in a sieve," and 'like a rat without a tail, do, do, and do,' Schiller's cannot condescend to things of that nature. They mention not of the brinded cat that hath mewed, nor the thrice and once that the hedgepig whined.

Such vulgarities were to Schiller not fit for the dignity of tragedy. Es giebt im Ernsthaften und Tragischen einige seltene Fälle, wo das Niedrige angewandt werden kann," he says in Über den Gebrauch des Gemeinen und Niedrigen in der Kunst."

But in such instances it must go to the extent of the frightful, the forcefully horrible, where the momentary shock to the taste is lost in the strength of the effect. A thief, for instance is absolutely below the fitness for art both in the judgment of taste and of morals. But does he become a murderer, while he sinks still lower as estimated from the moral standpoint, in the eyes of the aesthetic he is again restored. The petty vulgarisms of tongue

and acting, therefore, which give the proper witchcraft atmosphere to Shakespeare, stand condemned of Schiller as below fitness both of morals and aesthetics. They have to him no force nor power to excuse the attack on taste. That they do put the audience, or the reader into the proper mood for what is to come, he cannot conceive.

Shakespeare's witches ~~are~~ however, not merely the popular hags, who ~~is~~ are really but ~~a~~ women who have learned to brew charms to hurt others. They do, like them, have their superstitions, their physiques, but are more powerful. They have, like them, human passions; they trouble mankind out of motives of revenge. One tells with glee how she has tormented a poor sailor on land and sea, because his wife refused to give her of her chestnuts. But yet they have supernatural power. They are conceived as having control over wind and wave; they can make "castles topple on their warders' heads, palaces and pyramids slope their heads to their foundations." Says Dyer in Folklore of Shakespeare (p.26) "It has been urged that the sisters are hybrids between the Norns of Scandinavian mythology and witches. The supposed proof of this is that each sister exercises the special function of one of the Norns. 'The third' it is said, 'is the special prophetess, while the first takes cognizance of the past, and the second of the present in affairs connected with humanity. These are the tasks of Urda, Verdandi and Skulda. The first begins by asking, "When shall we three meet again?" The second decides the time, "When the battle's lost and

won." The third the future prophecies, "That will be ere the set of sun." The first again asks "Where?"; the second decides; "Upon the heath"; the third the future prophecies; "There to meet with Macbeth." ' But yet - " a more accurate poetical counterpart to the prose descriptions given by contemporary writers of the appearance of the poor creatures, who were charged with the crime of witchcraft could hardly have been penned." Hence it is more likely that it is really the every day witch that Shakespeare meant, with the added notion of a supernatural power over human minds.

Schiller repudiates the idea of anything supernatural in the workings of human beings, and hence makes divinities. His witches are somewhat a revival of the classic notion of the fatal sisters with an admixture from the "Hexensabbath" of the Middle Ages. In place of the common human features of Shakespeare, Schiller instils the classic notion of the jealous anger of the gods at the good fortune of a human being. They cannot do a lively fairy dance but stand still and impressive. His changed conception robbed the play of much that is cleverly fit and really good. His statelier incantations do not have nearly the power that Shakespeare's do. You expect to see something just cunningly treacherous and wicked from such as Hecate gives in,

"Pour in sow's blood that hath eaten
Her nine farrow; grease that's sweaten
From the murderer's gibbet throw

Into the flame."

(No ¶) It is the commanding goddess that really should bring greater forces to bear than merely puzzling double-dealing phrases, in Schiller:

"Grosz oder klein,
"Erschein! Erschein!
Und zeige dich
Und deine Pflicht bescheidentlich." To the same tune goes Schiller's chanted charm,

"Rüstig! rüstig! nimmer müde
"Feuer brenne! Kessel siede!"

No ¶ Compare with this the weird witchiness of the incantation in Shakespeare - meaningless, but yet suggesting meaning with a hidden power. -

"Double, double toil and trouble
Fire burn and cauldron bubble!"

The song which rounds off all the evil working Schiller inserts, that none of the trifling commonnesses of the ~~the~~ ~~the~~ original may appear. A very sedate ineffectual little quatrain it is that Schiller gives,

"Geister, schwarz, weisz, blau und grau
"Wie ihr euch auch nennt
Rührt um, rührt um, rührt um
Was ihr rühren könnt!"

We see what a lot of creepy things he leaves out when we look to

the song which beyond doubt Shakespeare meant. IT is from Middleton's Witch and used commonly for witches' purposes at that time.

"Black spirits and white, red spirits and gray
Mingle, mingle, mingle, you that mingle may.
Titty, Tiffin
Keep it stiff in
Firedrake Puckey
Make it lucky
Liard Robin
You must bob in
Round, around, around, about about.
All ill come running in, all good keep out."

Köster hits it quite right when he says, (p.114) "die Schillerschen Schicksalschwestern wollen sich weder äuszerlich noch innerlich recht in das Stück einfügen." Yet one must take into consideration that it is for a different people that Schiller is writing his play. His audience knows not the value nor the usual application of such suggestive nothingnesses. In a letter to his friend Körner, we find the remark, "Deine Bemerkung wegen der in die erste Hexen= Scene eingeschobenen deutlichen Enunciationen mag wohl gegründet sein, aber sie scheinen mir für das Theater nöthig weil die Masse des Publikums zu wenig Aufmerksamkeit hat und man ihr vordenken muszz." Much of the blame lies, of course, in the faultiness of a new language for reproducing peculiar ideas and oddities of another. Wieland, whom Schiller used for one of his sources,

makes no attempt at the witches' scene, giving simply a description of it and stating blankly that it is impossible of translation. Contrasted with this Schiller makes a beautiful attempt, quite true down to minute details.

Another noticeable change comes in the handling of the porter scene. Schiller changes the grossly sportive drunkard into a pious hymn singing piece of propriety. In Shakespeare we meet the tipsy guardian of the gate mocking his charge by playing, himself, the keeper of hell gate. Not till he is through with his sport does he mind his duty and let those knocking, in. 'Tis tending a higher duty that keeps Macduff and Ross waiting in Schiller,

> "Poch! poch'. Geduld da drauszen, wers auch ist!
> Den Pförtner laszt sein Morgenlied vollenden.
> Ein guter Tag fängt an mit Gottes Preisz,
> 'S ist kein Geschäft so eilig als das Beten." (2,6,10 56)

No. Here we have a keeper proud of his charge. He boasts of having spent the night protecting the welfare of Scotland, for

> Wacht nicht
> Des König's Auge für sein Volk, und ists
> Der Pförtner nicht, der Nachts den
> König hütet?" (2,6,1080)

In Shakespeare, however, the porter has shared the festivities of the evening by carousing at the palace gate. This is the much more likely situation. For it was universally the custom for feudal lords to distribute for revels among the servants when

there was feasting going on. The Macbeths show themselves considerate of their retainers and would surely not be behind in this. "Give him tending," says the Lady for the messenger who comes up all but dead for breath. Nor is it taken with surprise that Macbeth should kindly send his servant to retire, while's he himself would stay awake. Of course he merely wishes the servant away, but yet his consideration is not taken as anything unusual. To Schiller, however, ribaldry was the incongruity of incongruities. For him there could be no union of tragedy and comedy. In "Uber den Gebrauch des Gemeinen und Niedrigen in der Kunst," he states that the low can be only used where the sole object is to make fun. The true artist will use the low to provoke laughter, but never disgust. However, tragedy has no place for laughter. Where the tone of the rest has led us to expect only the high and elevated, the author sinks when he uses the common. Schiller would have all on the same plane - no reliefs, no contrasts. Not even the naturalness of the Shakespearean porter scene can atone to him for using anything so ordinary.

But how much more masterful is Shakespeare's way! We have but just followed the terrors of the night before to their terrible climax. We see in incredibly short time an unflecked soul changed to one spotted with the blackest kind of crime. Before we fully realize the crime conceived, it is finished. The emotions are kept on steady strain from the beginning. 'Tis very fit therefore that we should leave the murderers with the blood on their hands to

catch our breath before the heartrending discovery and disclosure. A little chance to laugh and relax gives better force to what immediately follows. Our impressions are not fagged to get the full effect of the wondrously worked excitement that Shakespeare affords in that early morning scene. We can scarcely find anything more forceful than the passage where Macduff shrieks out the start - ling news. Schiller's porter scene merely holds the suspense. It adds no new call for emotion, but gives no drop to our tension in a hearty laugh at utter absurdity. The old Greek artists insist- ed that tragedy and comedy should keep apart, and Schiller was walk- ing in their footsteps. There is not one single smile in the whole translation. You see he leaves out, too, the laughter which the precocious son of Macduff provokes in his wiseacre prattle. Such childish foolishness is below the dignity of tragedy to Schiller.

Note next the liberties that Schiller takes with Shakespeare's careful placing of scenes. He kept ever in mind that he was working a presentation for the stage. He strove ever to make the succession in staging easier and the kind of staging more possible. This care blinded him to many a wound to effect and many an improbability of situation, which he gives. He begins his work at simplification with the first Act. Up to scene seven (to which Scene four of Shakespeare corresponds) all action takes place to the same scenery. The king and his retinue meet the wounded captain in the same desert opening in which the witches meet. Shakespeare gives instead a martial staging that anticipates the nature of the proceedings to follow. It takes away, too, the appropriateness of the place as

merely for witchy dealings, to have such a breath from the battle-field, such an atmosphere of courage, strength and bravery find expression in it. Shakespeare, you see, comes back to the heath when witchcraft is to work - to leave it again for Forres when such dealings are over. With Scene seven, however, Schiller too finds a change of scene necessary. He agrees with the original to take the action to the king's palace. To the change to Inverness for the introduction of Lady Macbeth, Schiller also finds it necessary to agree. But once there he adopts his own scheme for the placing of events. As it is natural to conceive, Shakespeare has the letter from her husband delivered to the Lady in her room. To simplify the scenery effects to unity, Schiller has her read~~ing~~ the letter in the vestibule to the castle, - the front hall, you might say. That would sound feasible enough in the modern lady, who herself comes down to receive her correspondence as the postman flops it on the first available receptacle in the receiving hall. But the rare post of Macbeth's day had it's special deliverer who rendered it through the servants to the mistress - most likely in her private chambers. Still more improbable is it that it should be the gate keeper who would turn over the message. To be sure, he fits well enough with the vestibule placing, while he were certainly impossible were the Lady in the inner recesses, as in Shakespeare. But with the formal fitness of the court of so high a nob~~ility~~le as Macbeth, it seems incongruous to think of the porter taking the place of her Ladyship's regular attendant, whom Shakespeare uses.

With the arrival of the king we find such remarks as are to be expected when one approaches an edifice

"This castle hath a pleasant seat; the air

Nimbly and sweetly recommends itself

Unto our senses." There is every suggestion of the out of doors. The speakers give the impression they acquire with their approach. The king would scarcely be likely to speak of the general outward situation, once inside the vestibule where Schiller puts him. Nor is it probable that "the temple haunting martlet had made his pendent bed and procreant cradle" within the castle, and surely Shakespeare means to imply the actual seeing of these objects as calling forth these remarks. And then how strange that Macbeth should come out to that same vestibule to fight with the pros and cons to his conceived murder. To speak of such things aloud in such a general meeting place - why, that same porter might hear! How much more is this monologue the affair of the secret recesses of the private room where Shakespeare plants him. And thither, too, Schiller brings the Lady. Hwo could she have expected to find her lord brooding in the one room, above all others of general use? In the second act we have a perfect triumph of economy in staging. Schiller thinks he can consistently let all of the action occur in one and the same room of the castle. Shakespeare keeps the scenery unchanged till the fourth scene. But all his scenes are placed in an inner court of the castle, which is probable for all that takes place. But fancy the heinous improbability of the

porter piping out in a room of the palace - and that the same room where the Lord and Lady have but just ended their conference on the bloody deed just done. How absurd is a song sung at that hour, in such a place, in a voice which is

So helle Orgel in der Brust, dasz ihr damit eine
Ganz Schottland könntet aus dem Schlaf posaunen." (2,5,1074).

¶ There is no strain on the imagination, however, to fancy the porter entering the court to open the outward gate when he hears knocking without.

¶ Shakespeare rightly, too, puts the old man, who holds converse with Ross, "Without the Castle." For what could a plain old plebs like he be doing in a room at the castle of the most renowned and honoured lord of Scotland.

In Act III. Schiller still follows his policy of "jewing down" on the scenery. He cuts off parts to keep all at one setting, till the outdoor murder scene no longer leaves it possible. Shakespeare introduces a new room with scene two, from which the Lady begs the entrance of her lord. Schiller instead has her burst unannounced upon the private cogitations of Macbeth still in that same room where he has but just been conferring with the agents for his new murder. Through this aid to simplification it is that Schiller sacrifices that one ray of light into the suffering anguish of Lady Macbeth's heart. 'Tis the secret heart wrung "Naught's had, all's spent" that we miss here.

At the end of Act 111 and the beginning of Act 1V Schiller

institutes a mixed system of arrangement that is hard to explain. He takes the fifth scene of the third act of Shakespeare for the second of his fourth and the sixth for the first. He shows, I think, the proper feeling in the first change; for by it the two witches scenes are rightfully placed in the same act. They are immediately consequent to each other and I can see no reason for their being placed in different acts. The fourth Act begins the turn of tide against Macbeth; we see the first active counterworking. Hence Schiller is justified in planting the two scenes to which I refer with this act. But his inverted order spoils a very probable definite purpose with Shakespeare. The original probably aimed to keep the order of the first appearance of the witches. We have ~~the~~ in Act 1. a short witch scene with a hint of what's to do; then a courtly scene giving the attitude of the nobility; then the big witch scene with the real working of the supernatural. The break in upon the witch scenes keeps the two parallel views before the eye and shows the greater skill. Perhaps, however, Schiller wished the scene between the two lords to come first to give a hint at the downfall which is to be actively worked for; the suspicion of the two lords is the first actual intimation of a countertide.

Schiller places also the Lennox and Ross scene out in the open desert where the witches work. Of how they got there or what they were there for, there is no intimation. Since he could scarcely have these lords meet in the cavern where Shakespeare has the actual brewing, he omits the cavern entirely. Too bad - for the cavern is so very fit. Shakespeare changes situation for

each scene. The witches meet first on the heath - as in Schiller. The lords, however, are in a room at the castle at Forres where it is very probable for them to have been.

When we are done with the witch scenes we are aghast next at the boldness of the omission of a whole scene. He cuts out the entire occurrence at the castle of Macduff. Schiller would have nothing to spoil the straightforward unity of action. He did not conceive this as bearing directly on the main story of the play. But does it not serve to paint for us the Macbeth? And it is, too, the last straw, that sets the rebelling element into action. We miss through this personal acquaintance with Macduff's loss half the feeling of the pity for him, when we see his suffering. Schiller misses hereby to emphasize the very statement of his own theory as to what should call our pity. The first law is that the one we are to pity must really feel pain, the second that he resist the show of suffering. Thus he tells us in "Über das Pathetische." We find these both in Macduff.

"What, man!" says Malcolm to him,

"ne'er pull your hat upon your brows:

Give sorrow words; the grief that does not speak

Whispers the o'er fraught heart and bids it break."

Not. You see, he feels it to the full, but hides the show of it. Macduff states the essence of the theory in the answer to

"dispute it like a man" with

"I shall do so,

But I must also feel it as a man" and later,

"I cannot but remember such things were.

That were most precious to me."
We feel the effect of this the more strongly, if we, too, vividly "remember that such things were."

On the same ground of lack of purport to the main plot, Schiller omits the conversation which ensues, where in the third scene the entrance of a doctor gives occasion to a discourse on the healing power of the British king.

No. This is really a justifiable curtailment. To Shakespeare its only purpose lay in affording an opportunity of a compliment to his sovereign, for it advocates a belief in the king's divine power. We grant to Schiller that a grand tragedy like Macbeth is hurt by a stoop to such subtle flattery.

Another slight change in this same scene, however, seems to add nothing, by virtue of its alteration. Shakespeare places it before the King's Palace in England. This concrete statement recalls the first decision of Malcolm to fly thence; it reminds of the occasion; it connects all that has been transacted since. Schiller says instead, "Die Szene ist in einem Garten" This has not the connotation of the other and adds neither anything new, for the first spoken words would intimate such placing without it - "Lasz uns irgend einen öden Schatten

Aufsuchen," (4,6,2509).

No. "Before the King's Palace" with this would scarcely leave anything but a garden possible.

In the fifth Act the two authors actually start and end together.

But the in-between is a sad mix up to straighten out. Schiller exercises a great deal of ingenuity to work out a new scheme entirely. He brings together the severed pieces for the preparation for assault into the consecutive second and third scene. Then he proceeds to pick out the scattered bits of the scenes at Macbeth's castle and builds them into the consecutive 4,5,6, and7. Shakespeare purposely takes a bit from one side and them slips over to the other, to keep the two parallel in our minds and that the effect of confusion and excitement be maintained. Schiller's strenuous efforts entirely undo this effect. He occasionally omits, too, to make things run more smoothly. From the end of the third scene, he omits the discourse between the leaders of the opposition to Macbeth. No harm is really done, however, by this omission. At the beginning of scene three, he takes the first three lines of Shakespeare's scene four, and switches off into a long insertion, which explains clearly the presence of Lennox and his bunch of followers with the rebels. Shakespeare omits to elucidate this, but Schiller cannot bear to think of anything being left unclear. After this ~~self-made~~ explanation, Schiller jumps back to a snatch from the middle of scene two of Shakespeare and ends with the beginning of Shakespeare's scene four, whose end however, he lets slip entirely.

Schiller's excessive tampering can be somewhat excused on the ground of his really attaining to the aim he set for himself in the beginning - a practical stage presentation - so far as regards staging purposes. While in reading it, the flurry of the sudden change from one camp to another is the best for producing the effect,

in actual execution the hurry of the short shifted scenes, would be lost in the long intermissions necessary for the change of scenery.

Then, there are a number of other changes that are really of minor note. However, they are changes and as such we will take note of them. Schiller makes Malcolm to seem a lesser man than does Shakespeare. - one of less weighty importance. Where we first meet with the young heir, Schiller mingles the original concept with that of Donalbain - the two are alike of little account. In the Shakespearean second scene of Act one, only Malcolm is given prominence enough to let his voice be heard. Schiller puts these words into the mouth of the brother and puts the observations of the next speech, which Lennox makes, to Malcom's account. Again, in the scene at the palace of Forres, with Shakespeare it is Malcolm that can speak in court to tell of Cawdor's death. He is important enough to express his opinions - and expresses them well, too. This speech, too, Schiller turns over to Donalbain. The kingly father on naming the Prince of Cumberland in Sheakespeare, expresses a possibility of greatness in his son when he says; -

"Signs of hobleness, like stars shall shine
On all deservers."

This Schiller changes to a commonplace flattery on the courtiers;

"Der einzge Vorzug soll ihn kennbar machen,
Aus unsrer treflichen Baronen Zahl,

Thron umschimmern!" (1,8,477).
In the last scene of the first act, Schiller goes on to insert on his own responsibility, through the persuasive mouth of the Lady, that Malcolm is, "ein schwacher Knabe," whom the thanes will not consent to serve. Nearing the end, where in Shakespeare Malcolm has really shown himself to have a strong personality, capable of command, Schiller still tries to depict him as the boy, where Seiward is the real power. In Act V, Scene 3, 3096 it is Seiward, who gives the command that every man hew him down a branch to carry, but with Shakespeare, it is Malcolm's shrewd suggestion.

This alteration seems purposed to excuse in some measure the crime of Macbeth. It fits the changed concept of him that Schiller strives to give. It might be quite in accord with the noble hearted, "der Tapfere, der Beste," to seek for the crown, where it was universally deemed that the kingdom were going to a silly boy, who had no individuality. It is less base to usurp a throne, that a fitter person may fill it. The interest of a country should naturally be placed before those of an individual. Malcolm and Donalbain being alike unimportant, it is the more excuseable that the first hero of the land and the next in line for the throne, should under compulsion of supernatural agencies be induced to active steps for the throne.

In the minor persons Schiller institutes several changes. He cuts out several. He was fitting a play to the stage at hand, rather than making a faithful translation, and he had not players

enough to fit every little role that meant nothing. Ross he gives a bigger part to play than Shakespeare. But Lennox and Angus are minimized. At Forres in the seventh scene of first act Macduff is given the words of Lennox, Macduff being essential anyway. In this same court scene (scene 8) Schiller substitutes Lennox for Angus, that neither have more to say than the other.

At the discovery of Duncan's murder, it is the more important Ross who is Macduff's companion, instead of Lennox, as Shakespeare has it. With Schiller, Lennox and Angus come upon this scene later, but have nothing to say. Schiller has Ross to give the first indications of suspicion against Macbeth. Lennox but falls to his way of thinking. 'Tis Lennox however who has the initiate thought in Shakespeare - and we do not even know whether it is Ross to whom he is speaking - "Enter Lennox and another Lord."

In the last act Schiller cuts out entirely the personages of Menteith and Caithness. The words of Menteith are given Angus, Lennox takes the words of Angus, and Angus himself the remarks of Caithness.

To complete the difference, Schiller deviates far from the original style. He is still in the swing of the Wallenstein verse, and Macbeth talks, a Wallenstein. To Shakespeare the verse is a means to an end. Everywhere it is established to make the speech characteristic of the speaker. - sometimes to the inward hurt of the verse as verse. In fact where verse becomes a hindrance, or does not suit the nature of the dialogue, he lapses from poetry into

prose. The every day things which pass comment between the nurse and the doctor, would seem stilted and not the every day things they are, if set to feet. The prose gives the atmosphere of a real sick room. Schiller however, carefully divides the consultation into properly measured lines and feet equal with all the rest of the work. In the porter scene, too, it is so fit that the foolish sport of the drunk man should be in prose. Imagine how prim it would be of a porter to hell to talk in rhythm! Of course when Schiller remakes the porter, there is nothing more fit for the pious psalm singing creature than verse. To Schiller, however, there could be no more mixing of the style in the highest drama, than there could be a combination of comedy and tragedy. And unity of style demanded unity of form. In 1797 he wrote to Goethe: "Ich habe nie so augenscheinlich mich überzeugt als bei meinem jetzigen Geschäft (der Wallenstein), wie genau in der Poesie Stoff und Form, selbst äussere, zusammenhängen. Der Rhytmus leistet bei einer dramatischen Production noch dieses grosze und bedeutende, dasz er, indem er alle Situationen nach einem Gesetz behandelt, und sie trotz ihres inneren Unterschiedes in einer Form ausführt, er dadurch den Dichter und seinen Leser nöthiget, von allem noch so charakteristischverschiedenen etwas all gemeines, rein menschliches zu verlangen."

But his constant adherence to one kind of style breaks much that gives characteristic. Above all else is the Shakespearean style fitting for its situation. In the second scene where the wounded captain is brought in, the speech is broken - well punctuated

with dashes and breaks in the middle of lines. This is quite fit for one hurt to the fainting stage. Schiller's "Ritter" instead gives an eloquent, profoundly worded description of the fight. We do not with him note the distress; scarcely even when he calmly ends - "ich bin erschöpft, und meine Wunden fordern Hilfe." There is not the short-lined breathlessness of Shakespeare which breaks off with

"I cannot tell -

But I am faint, my gashes cry for help."

Shakespeare dares even be bold enough to use a figure unfit the time, that the proper effect may be had.

No 7 The captain in his hurried narration says,

"If I say sooth, I must report they were

As cannons over charged with double cracks."

Schiller evades the anachronism but loses the force in his substitute

"Noch ehe sie den Schweisz der ersten Schlacht

Von ihrer Stirn gewischt, -"

How flat!

In this passage one can get a kind of an index to Schiller's change of treatment throughout the whole play. 1. He omits whole lines, for there is no correspondence to -

" for to that the multitudinous villanies of nature

Do. swarm upon him"; nor for, "No sooner justice had with valour armed -" 2. He omits plays on words: "So they

<u>Doubly</u> <u>redoubled</u> strokes" which he renders "versuchten sie

Das Glück in einem neuen Kampf."

3. He changes figures of speech. Compare "The merciless Macdonwald ---

Showed like a rebel's whore "and Der wütige Macdonald---wie ein reissender Gewitterstrom." 4. He fills out short lines - has all his of one length. The last speech of the wounded man has in Shakespeare one line of two words, another of three, one of four, over against others of eight and nine. Schiller makes the speech seven lines of exactly five iambic feet each. 5. Schiller avoids ends of sentences in the middle of his lines whenever he can. He prolongs the thought to fit the verse limits. For instance, of Duncan's introductory interrogations, he boldly leaves out the first question, which causes a caesura where it ends. But he brings in the idea of the question in a remark which can stop itself with a semicolon at the end of the verse.

"What bloody man is that? He can report

As seemeth by his plight of the revolt

The newest state" But - "Hier bringt man einen Ritter aus der Schlacht;

Jetzt werden vir des Treffens Ausschlag hören."

~~Aus chlag hören~~" Note that in the second line he again has no break, nor does his third end with so few feet as to necessitate the next speech to begin on the third foot. This is typical of his treatment throughout the play. At times there can be found five or six instances to the page.

Schiller's careful reliving of the events of the thirty year's War for his history and again for his Wallenstein had so saturated

his mind with their atmosphere that it was not so much his desire to leave his martial stamp on the masterpiece of another but, rather, „die Anschauungen des dreiszigjährigen Krieges waren mit ihrer eigenen Phraseologie ihm so in Fleisch und Blut übergegangen, dasz er ohne sein Wissen, mit ihnen lebte." (Köster p. 89) In those places where Schiller lets go and works in his own vein, that style pervades. Everywhere there are traces of direct descent from Wallenstein. Many individual words show the connection. In Schiller, Duncan dubs Banquo and Macbeth as „unsre Obersten". The older translations say „Feldherren" or „Kriegsgefährte" - but Oberst was the modern Wallensteinian term for captain. Cawdor is called „Reichsverräter" where Shakespeare says „disloyal traitor". In Wallenstein's day one first began to talk of „das deutsche Reich", and there the term of Schiller would be proper, but were not likely for Scotland. An „Eilbote" announces the coming of Duncan to Inverness - he got his existence in Wallenstein, for Shakespeare has the Lady's attendant speak of the messenger as "one of my fellows". Again just as Octavio, Macbeth „stellt in jedem Hause seinen Horcher an."

Köster says, (p. 90) „dasz der Ausdruck bei Schiller nicht immer dem Shakespearischen gleichkommt, dasz ihm manche beabsichtigte Feinheit entgangen ist, dasz er bisweilen undeutlich wird und nicht so concret redet, wie der englische Dichter, das lag wohl an seiner Unkenntnis der fremden Sprache und der Unzuverlässigkeit der Übersetzungen. Manche stilistische Änderung ist auch beabsichtigt. Shakespeares Verse sind oft eckig, der Satzbau strebt sich gegen

den Rhythmus. Schiller übt das entgegensetzte Verfahren. Um dem Wort seinmausreichenden Platz zu verschaffen, ist er lieber weitläufig als zu knapp. Daher den häufigen Flickwörter und überflüssigen Anreden, die den Vers füllen."

Many of Schiller's faultinesses are due to his following the translations of Wieland and Eschenburg. (Köster p.85) Where he could not decide between his two sources he would try to effect a compromising resultant or even put down both versions. For instance where Shakespeare says,

"Ihave supp'd full with horrors"

Wieland renders,

"ich habe mit Schreckgespenstern zunacht essen gelernt;"

Eschenburg,

"Itzt bin ich mit Schrecken gesättigt geworden,"

Schiller gives the combination -

"Ich habe zu Nacht gegessen mit Gespenstern
Und voll gesättigt bin ich von Entsetzen."

Again he doubles in

"Wenn wirs verfehlten - wenn der Streich mislänge?" Where Shakespeare has merely, "If we should fail?" Wieland had rendered this through,

"Wenn es uns mislünge -"

Eschenburg - "Wenn wir's verfehlen sollten?" We find yet another instance in

"Regen wechsle mit Sonnenschein!
Häszlich soll schön. Schön häszlich sein,"

where Shakespeare has the idea but once in

"Fair is foul and foul is fair"

See also the vast extension over "We rest your hermits" that is found in.

nichts bleibt uns übrig, als

Gleich armen Klausnern, nur an Wünschen reich

Mit brünstigen Gebeten euch zu dienen."

Part of this he owes to Wieland;

"Es bleibt uns nichts übrig, als---

eure armen Fürbitter zu bleiben;" and part from Eschenburg;

"Es bleibt uns nichts übrig als inbrünstig wie Einsiedler für Euch zu beten."

Often times wrong concepts were also due to his sources, for example, Shakespeare's

"Cool it with a baboon's blood" we find in Schiller

"Kühlt's mit eines Säugling's Blut."

Schlegel later rendered this correctly

"Kühlt's mit eines Affen Blut" ~~but Schiller did not refer to him.~~

Wieland is the authority for his "Säugling."

Finally Schiller grew tired of trying to be peacemaker between two opposing texts and resorted to having the English original read to him. To Goethe he writes in 1800, "Seitdem ich das Original von Schakespeare mir von der Frau von Stein habe gelesen lassen, finde ich dasz ich wirklich besser gethan, mich gleich daran zu halten, so wenig ich auch das englische verstehe, weil der Geist des Gedankens viel unmittelbarer wirkt, und ich oft unnötige Mühe hatte durch das schwerfällige Medium meiner beiden Vorgänger mich zu dem wahren Sinn

of the third Act on he used the original. He can even bring in a few of the Shakespearean word plays after that.

"Wär es auch abgethan, wenn es gethan ist,

"Dann wär es gut es würde rasch gethan," we find as Schiller's translation for the beginning of Macbeth's monologue, "If 'twere done, when 'tis done, then 'twere well

It were done quickly."

But many of Shakespeare's best plays on words, best figures of speech Schiller changes not from any reason of tampered sources, but through simply a striving to better, where in nearly every instance he falls short instead. Where the figure is kept we will make no note of it, but the following lists the most of the figures changed.

1. 1,2 - 39

As cannons overcharged with double cracks.

1,2,100

Noch ehe sie den Schweisz der ersten Schlacht

Von ihrer Stirn gewischt -

2. 1,2 - 14

And fortune on his damned quarrel smiling

Showed like a rebel's whore.

1,2,70

Wie ein reiszender Gewitterstrom

Durchbrach er würgend unsre Reihen

3. This one has the same alliterative letter, but not in such pretty, unusual wording

1,2 - 48 From Fife -

Where Norweyan banners flout the sky,

And fan our people cold.

1,3,121,

Von Fife mein König, wo Norweyens Fahnen,

Vor wenig Tagen ---

4. 1,2 - 54 Till that Bellona's bridegroom lapped in proof.

1,3,130 bis endlich

Macbeth mit unbezwinglich tapferm Arm.

5. 1,3,38 fair is foul

1,5,220 so schön zugleich und häszlich

6. 1,3 - 128 As happy prologues to the swelling act of imperial theme.

1,6,376. Ein hoffnungsvolles Pfand des höchsten Dritten!

7. 1-4- 39 Which honour must

Not unaccompanied, invest him only

But signs of nobleness, like stars shall shine

On all deservers.

1,8,477 Der einzge Vorzug soll ihn kennbarmachen

Aus unsrer treflichen Baronen Zahl,

Die gleich Gestirnen uhsern

Thron umschimmern

8. 1 - 4 14 To catch the nearest way

1 - 8, 520, um den nächsten Weg zu gehn.

9. 1 - 4- 13 Too full of the milk of human kindness

1-8, Du bist zu sanft geartet.

10. 1 -6- 5 heaven's breath smells wooingly here

1-12,620 des Himmels Athem lieblich schmeckt.

1-6-8 pendent bed and procreant cradle

1-12,623, sein hangend Bette

Zur Wiege für die Jungen angebaut.

12. Here the word play is Schiller's and not in Shakespeare.

1-12,621--keine Friesen, sehe keine

Verzahnung, kein vorspringendes Gebälk,

Wo dieser Vogel

1-6-6 no jutty, frieze, buttress nor coign of vantage.

13. 1-7-21. like a newborn babe

Striding the blast or heavens

Cherubim horsed

Upon the sightless couriers of the air

1-14,688 wie ein neugebornes

Kind vom Himmel wieder-fahren

14. 1-7,60 But screw your courage to the sticking place.

1-15,766 Führ es aus mit Männermuth

Und fester Hand

15. 1-2 with Tarquin's ravishing strides

1-3 mit gros - weit aus gelo^ten Räubers-chritten.

16. 2-3,61 confusion now hath wrought his masterpiece

2-8-116 Der Frevel hat sein Aergstes

Vollbracht.

17. 2-3-107 Here lay Duncan

His silver skin laced with his golden blood.

2-10,1243. Hier lag

Duncan - Sein königlicher Leib von Dolchen

Enstellt, zerrissen!

18. 2-3-119 our tears are not yet brewed

2-10,1266 unsre Thränen

Sind noch nicht reif.

19. 2-3-129 Let's put on manly readiness

2-10,1290 Jetzt werfen wir uns schnell in unsre Kleider,-

20 2-4-8 Is't night's predominance or the day's shame

That darkness does the face of earth entomb

When living light should kiss it?

For this beautiful passage there is no correspondence in Schiller.

21. 3-1-12 a gap in our great feast

And all thing unbecoming

3-1,1425 ein Risz

In unsern Feste, und die Krone fehlt ihm.

22. 2-1-104 and I will put that business in your bosoms

Whose execution takes your enemy off,

Grapples you to the heart and love of us

Who wear our health but sickly in his life

Which in his death were perfect.

3-4-1651 Rächet euch und mich

An einem Feinde, der uns gleich verhaszt ist.

23. 3-1-124 to your assistance do make love.

3-4,1678 Bedarf ich eures Arms zu dieser That:

24. 3-1-134 to leave no rubs, nor blotches in the work

3-4-1692. um nichts halb zu thun.

25. 2-1-137 must embrace the fate

3-4-1696 Das Schicksal dieser finstern Stunde theilen.

26. 3-2-22 life's fitful fever

3-5-1795 auf des Lebens Fieberangst.

27. 3-2-26 Sleek o'er your rugged looks

3-5-1741 Klärt eure finstern Blicke auf

28. 3-2-33 we must lave our honors in these flattering streams

3-5-1746 Und spare nicht die glatte Schmeichelrede.

29. 3-2-46 seeling night

3-5,1774, blinde Nacht

30. 3-4-24 cabined, cribbed, confined

3-8,1904 eingeengt, gebunden,

Und meinen alten Schrecknissen aufs neu

Zum Raub dahin gegeben.

31. 3-4-137 Stepped in so far, that, should I wade no more

Returning were as tedious as go o'er.

Strange things I have in head that will to hand

Which must be acted ere they may be scanned.

There is no rhyme in Schiller:

3-9-2123.

Seltsame Dinge wälzt mein Geist bey sich

Herum, die einen raschen Arm erfordern

Und That seyn müssen, ehe sie Werte sind.

32. 2-6-31 To wake Northumberland

And warlike Siward

4-1-2186 Dasz er den tapfern Seiward uns zum Beistand

Hersende

33. 4-3-165 Cannot be called our mother, but our grave

4-7-2716 Nicht unser

Geburtsland, uhser Grab nur.

34. 4-3-175 That of an hour's age, does hiss the speaker.

4-7-2735 Wer das Unglück

Der vorgen Stunde meldet, sagt was Altes.

35. 4-13-188 women fight to doff the dire distresses

4-7-2763 Weiber selbst zum Fechten treiben

36. 4-4-195 Where hearing should not latch them

4-7-2774, wo sie kein Ohr empfinge

37. 4-4-206 on the quarry of these murdered deer,
to add the death of you.

4-7-2794 auf ihren Tod noch den deinen häufen.

38. 5-2-15 He cannot buckle his distempered cause

Within the belt of rule.

5-3-3072 Wohl mag er seiner selbst nicht Meister bleiben,

In diesem Kampf der Wuth und der Verzweiflung.

40. 5-217 Now does he feel

His secret murders sticking on his hands

5-3-3075 Nuh schieszt die Blut-saat, die er ausgesät.

Zur fürchterlichen Ernte rächend auf.

41. 5-3-8 with these English epicures

5-43119 An diese brittschen Zärtlinge.

42. 5-3-20 this push

Will chair me ever, or disseat me now.

5-4-1142. Dieser Stosz versichert

Mein Glück auf immer, oder stürzt mich jetzt.

43. 5-3-44 cleanse the stuff'd bosom of that perilous stuff

5-5-3182. Nicht sonst mit irgend einem süszen Mohn

Den Krampf auflösen, der das Herz erstickt?

44. 5-7 the castle's gently rendered

5-11-3365 - Das Schlösz hat sich ergeben.

45. 5-7 incompassed with thy kingdom's pearl.

5-14-3483 Umgeben von den Edeln deines Reichs.

In nearly every instance Schiller renders the charmingly worded figures in somewhat less poetic paraphrase. His renditious have all an equal sound, while the originals have a delicious turn that fits the changing situation. Schillers Stil ist geschmückt, rhetorisch" - Even where Shakespeare purposed there should be no finish, he has it. Where Shakespeare has Macbeth's sleep murdering speech all broken, Schiller uses finished verses with even the completing touch of rhyme; Schiller has a finished discourse in place of a series of disconnected stabs of conscience. Schiller is never cleverly sparing of words as is his original. In that there are lines left purposely unfinished. Schiller fills them out. He prefers to devote several lines to elucidate clearly a few Shakespearean words, all pregnant with meaning. Here are a few examples.

1. 1-6 for those of old

And the late dignities heaped upon them

We rest your hermits.

1-13 als für die alten Gunst-bezeugungen

Wie für die neuen, die Ihr drauf gehäuft

Gleich armen Klausnern, nur an Wünschen reich

Mit brünstigen Gebeten Euch zu dienen.

2. 2-2 To know my deed, 'twere best not know myself

2-4 Mir diesen That bewuszt zu sein, O besser

Mir ewig selbst nicht mehr bewuszt sein.

3. 2-3 Against the undivulged pretence I fight

Of treasonous malice.

2-10. Kämpf ich jeder Beschuldigung entgegen, die Verrath

Und Bosheit wider mich ersinnen mögen.

4. 3-2- should have died with them they think on.

3-5 die dem, an dem sie denken

Ins nichtige Grab hinab gefolgt sein sollten.

5. 3-2 Things bad begun make strong themselves by ill.

3-5 Was blutig anfängt mit Verrat und Mord

Das setzt sich nur durch

blut'ge Thaten fort.

6. 3-4 Ourselves will mingle with society

And play the humble host

3-8 Wir selber wollen uns bald hier bald dort

In die Gesellschaft mischen und das Amt

Des auf wortsamen (no new line)

Hauswirts übernehmen.

7. 3-5 But make amends now

4-2 Macht's wieder gut und den Betrug

Den ihr begannt, vollendet klug.

Der Vers war für Schiller zum Teil Selbst zweck; der

Wohllaut der Rede als solcher, sollte oft wirken in der schönen Form, die schöne Seele." (Köster p.105) To adhere to completed verse form Schiller resorted also to the use of extra words of address. It would seem that he could not bear to see his page with an uneven zigzag of verse endings. He did his best to fill out. Throughout the play we find such instances as these where the brackets indicate words not given in Shakespeare.

1-4 Schwester was hast du geschafft? (Lasz hören!)

1-6 (Hum!) Stund es so etc

1-8 O teuer Vetter (Stütze meines Reichs)

1-8 Sey mir willkommen (edler teuer Held!)

1-13 Ihr seyd in eurem Eigenthum (mein König)

1-15 (Weib!) Ich bin entschlossen

2-2 Wie (edler) Sir?

2-2 (Nun; Sir) Mir träumte--

2-4 (Wie, Sir?) Was soll das--

2-4 (Wie?) Wer war's denn-

2-4 (Komm!) Deine Stärke hat dich ganz verlassen

2-7 (Sir,) das war eine ungestüme Nacht.

3-5 (Kommt, Kommt mein König)

3-8 (Glaubt mir) Schade nur

3-8 (Ich bitte dich)

In working his play for stage presentation another thing we notice is how Schiller peppers his translation full of minute stage directions. He brings in through them additional details to clarify, to make accurate and certain the proper placing. For

instance Shakespeare is content to say merely in the second scene of Act one, "meeting a bleeding captain;" Schiller however adds "der von zwei Soldaten geführt wird." Where in certain speeches part is addressed to one person and part to another, Shakespeare takes it for granted that it is obvious whom is being addressed. Schiller however feels it necessary to be explicit and sprinkles in thick and fast directions such as this; Macbeth (für sich); Banquo (zu Macbeth); Banquo (zu Rosse und Angus). He provides for biplay with his suggestions- (Banquo spricht seitwärts mit beiden). Many a time his directions are decidedly redundant. What need of an (Umarmt ihn) after "Lasz mich dich umarmen.

Und an mein Herz dich drücken!" Or again what need is there of (gedankenvoll) where the whole scene is but a monologue that is all contemplation? And why is it necessary to insert a (zum Bedienten) where the sole personages on the stage are the speaker and the servant? Continually, too, Schiller posts us as to the identical spot where the speaker is to stand. These things would really take care of themselves in the actual presentation - the directions impede freedom of action. We find such everywhere, where Shakespeare has them not. Macbeth (drinnen); (tritt auf); Lady (zurück kommend); (ihn fortziehend);

"Sorgt für die Lady!" (Macduff, Banquo, Rosse sind um sie beschäftigt); Banquo (zu denen, welche die Lady wegführen); Banquo (indem er sich wehrt); (Alle setzen sich auszer Macbeth); Macbeth (mit Entsetzen, indem er den Geist erblickt); Lennox (ganz gleichgültig auf den Geist deutend).

There is one pet device of Schiller's which we have not yet mentioned. To give anything special emphasis he tries to set it in monologue form at the end of a scene. At the end of scene four of act one Macbeth makes his first resolve.

"The Prince of Cumberland
That is a step
On which I must fall down, or else o'erleap,
For in my way it lies. Stars, hide your fires;
Let not light see my black and deep desires;
The eye wink at the hand; yet let that be
Which the eye fears, when 'tis done to see." But in Shakespeare there follows yet a short speech of Duncan's which robs it of its finality. We lose the contrast effect which this little eulogy affords in Schiller - sacrifice it to having the fact that the decisive step is taken, stand last in our mind. In the third act again, Schiller gives Macbeth's speech the strength of monologue where it is lacking in Shakespeare. The Lady accompanies her guests out from the disturbed banqueting room and Macbeth is alone when he says

"Blut! es fordert Blut !" and goes on to tell how murder has always found a way to leak out. That speech done, Schiller has the Lady come in again. Consistently, too, with this monologue system, does Schiller's scheme of making a new scene with every entrance give the Lady's speech as she reads her letter, the effect of monologue - at least to the reader.

The play as Schiller gives it shows a vast deal of original

thinking when we consider the whole reviewed which we have now been taking to pieces. It shows beyond any doubt, to what extent Schiller felt and appreciated the wondrous beauty and fitness of the original work. The fact that Schiller „dennoch tyrranisierte" is due mostly to the fact that for his dramatic speech he demanded clearness before all else. It was not, he said, an absolute demand of Art but was done as a concession to the public. To get the best appreciation of his work, says Köster, one must not read it but hear it, bearing in mind ever his consistent striving at a product fit for presentation. He strove as much to work the senses as the passions and reason. He left out neither decorative pomp to suit the eye, nor charm of verse for the ear. He never sacrificed style to working a grand effect, but worked carefully a perfect finish every instant. Even if he could he would not have done otherwise. He was rejoicing in a new-found talent. „Ich fange endlich an, mich des dramatischen Organs zu bemächtigen und mein Handwerk zu verstehen". He writes to Körner. Dies neue dramatische Organ und die Reform der Bühne, das war für ihn nur Eines, Und dem ersten musste sich fügen, was der letzteren dienen sollte, auch das Kunstwerk eines fremden Dichters."

„Wer also das Original vergleichend neben die Bearbeitung legt, der wird viele Mängel entdecken, und die Übertragung des fremden Stils vielleicht als einen einzigen groszen Misgriff bezeichnen. Dennoch war mit diesem Unternehmen der entscheidende Schritt zur Darstellung des wahren „Macbeth" gethan. Und wer nun gar die Vergleichung aufgibt und nur die Bearbeitung allein auf sich wirken

läszt, besonders aber, wer den Schillerschen Versen ihre lebendige Wirkung auf das Ohr vergönnt, der musz doch eingestehen, dasz hier ein imponierendes Werk aus einem Gusse vorliegt."

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1. Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, Tragedies and Poems.
III Tragedies. Edited by Richard Grant White, Boston, 1883

2. Schiller's Sämmtliche Schriften, Dreizehnter Teil
Herausgegeben von Wilhelm Vollmer - in Verein
mit Karl Goedeke, u.a.
Stuttgart, 1870.

3. Briefwechsel zwischen Schiller und Goethe in den Jahren, 1794
bis 1805.
Erster Band, 1794 bis 1797.
Stuttgart und Augsburg, 1856.

4. Schiller's Briefs, herausgegeben von Fritz Jonas
Stuttgart, Leipzig, Berlin, Wien, 1896.
(I 64, 208. IV 428. V 119, 183. VI 132, 133, 150, 162)

5. Schiller's Leben von Gustav Schwab (p. 546)
Zweiter Druck.
Gütersloh, 1859.

6. Schiller-Schriften von Kuno Fischer
Zweite Reihe, 4. Schiller als Philosoph,
Heidelberg, 1892.

7. Schiller's Leben, ~~auf der Grundlage der~~ Geistesentwickelung und Werke, von Karl Hoffmeister. ~~Sämmtlichen Schriften, bearbeitet von Heinrich Viehoff.~~
~~Dritter~~ Vierter Teil ~~(p. 154)~~ Stuttgart, 1840.

8. Marbacher Schillerbuch herausgegeben vom Schwäbischen Schillerverein. Zweite Auflage.
Stuttgart und Berlin, 1905.

9. Schiller von Eugen Kühnemann.
Erste und zweite Auflage
München, 1905 (p. 363, 451, 489)

10. Schiller's Leben und Werke von Emil Palleske
Fünfzehnte Auflage. Erster Band.
Stuttgart, 1900. (p. 321, 325)

11. Schiller von Otto Harnack.
Zweite verbesserte Auflage (p. 348, 349)
Berlin, 1905.

12. Schiller, Sein Leben und seine Werke, von Karl Berger.
Erster Band. Erste und zweite Auflage.
München, 1905.

13. Schiller's Sämmtliche Werke. Elfter Band.
Philosophische Schriften, Erster und Zweiter Teil.
Stuttgart und Berlin, 1904.

14. Schiller als Dramaturg, von Albert Köster ,
Berlin, 1891.

15. The Moral System of Shakespeare by Richard Moulton,
New York, 1903.

16. Shakespearean Tragedy by A. C. Bradley.
Second Edition, London, 1905.

17. On Ten Plays of Shakespeare by Stopford Brooke,
New York, 1905.

18. Folk-Lore of Shakespeare by the Rev. T. F. T. Dyer,
New York, 1884.

19. Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist by Thomas Lounsbury,
London, 1901. (p. 129 - 208)

20. The Shakespearean Drama. A commentary by Denton Snider.
The Tragedies.
Boston, 1887.

21. The Portrayal of the Moral Life by Frank Sharp,
New York, 1902.

22. Shakespeare's Heroines by Anna Jameson.
London, 1900.

23. The Tragedy of Macbeth, Edited by E. K. Chambers
Boston, 1906.
(Introduction, Notes and Appendix)

24. Shakespeare Characteere von Julius Thümmel.
Zweiter Band. Halle, 1887.

25. Short Studies of Shakespeare's Plots by Cyril Ransome.
London, 1890.

26. Gericke Zu einer neuen Bühnenbearbeitung des Macbeth.
Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft, VI.

27. Steinweg, Zum Macbeth, Shakespeares, Schillers und Davenants,
Nene Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, u.s.w. VI p.703.